

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the consideration given during the interview of June 12, 2007. During the interview, an Amendment was presented to further distinguish the claims over U.S. Patent No. 6,032,153 to *Sadiq et al.* By way of summary, the Examiner acknowledged that the proposed Amendment overcomes *Sadiq et al.* Accordingly the above proposed amendments correspond to those of claims 1, 9, 10, and 11 as discussed during the interview.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is the Examiner's position that the language "the respective partial structured query language statements" in line 9 of claim 1 is lacking antecedent basis. In response to the Examiner's indication, claim 1 has been amended to change the word "statements" to "statement".

Accordingly, all claims now present in the application are fully definite, and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-3, 9-11 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 9-11 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,032,153 to *Sadiq et al.* Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As indicated above, in the personal Interview of June 12, 2007, the Examiner acknowledged that the proposed Amendments overcome *Sadiq et al.* Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Rejection of Claims 4 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,032,153 to *Sadiq et al.* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0093433 (*Seaman et al.*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

It is respectfully submitted that the amendments to claims 1 and 11 have been indicated as allowable over *Sadiq et al.* and it is submitted that *Seaman et al.* likewise fail to teach or suggest this claimed subject matter. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 4 and 20 are in condition for allowance, at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claims 1 and 11, respectively.

Accordingly, Applicants request that the above rejection of claims 4 and 20 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 5 and 19 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,032,153 to *Sadiq et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,950,188 to *Wildermuth*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

It is respectfully submitted that the amendments to claims 1 and 11 have been indicated as allowable over *Sadiq et al.* and it is submitted that *Wildermuth* likewise fail to teach or suggest

this claimed subject matter. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5 and 19 are in condition for allowance, at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claims 1 and 11, respectively.

Accordingly, Applicants request that the above rejection of claims 5 and 19 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 6 and 12-14 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 6 and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,032,153 to *Sadiq et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,219,676 to *Reiner*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

It is respectfully submitted that the amendments to claims 1 and 11 have been indicated as allowable over *Sadiq et al.* and it is submitted that *Reiner* likewise fail to teach or suggest this claimed subject matter. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 6 and 12-14 are in condition for allowance, at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claims 1 and 11, respectively.

Accordingly, Applicants request that the above rejection of claims 6 and 12-14 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 7, 8 and 16-18 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7, 8 and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,032,153 to *Sadiq et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,743,806 to *Reiner et al.* Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

It is respectfully submitted that the amendments to claims 1 and 11 have been indicated as allowable over *Sadiq et al.* and it is submitted that *Reiner et al.* likewise fail to teach or suggest this claimed subject matter. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 7, 8 and 16-18 are in condition for allowance, at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claims 1 and 11, respectively.

Accordingly, Applicants request that the above rejection of claims 7, 8 and 16-18 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing claims 1-20 in condition for allowance. Applicants submit that the proposed amendments of claims 1, 9, 10, and 11 do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully point out that the final action by the Examiner presented some new arguments as to the application of the art against Applicants invention. It is respectfully submitted that the entering of the Amendment would allow the Applicants to reply to the final rejections and place the application into condition for allowance.

Additionally Applicants submit that the entry of the Amendment would place the application into better form for Appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that this claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the documents applied against this application. Applicants therefore request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes that additional discussions or information might advance the prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below to expedite resolution of any outstanding issues.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 50-2961.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 27, 2007

By: Barbara A. Fisher
for Bryan S. Latham
Reg. No. 49,085

Barbara A. Fisher
Reg. No. 31,906

MH2 Technology Law Group
Tel: 703.917.0000